

REMARKS

By the present Amendment, claim 3 has been amended to again depend from claim 1 similar to claim 3 of the original claims. It is noted that when claim 3 was previously dependent on claim 1, the Examiner examined all of the claims of record on the merits.

In view of the amendments to claim 3, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's restriction/unity of invention requirement has been rendered moot. Nonetheless, applicants hereby elect the subject matter of Group I which included claims 1 and 2. Since claims 3 and 4 are now dependent from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, the unity of invention standard includes such claims and all of the claims should be considered together consistent with the previous treatment of the original claims.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the comments relating to claims 1 and 2 in the Amendment filed on November 1, 2005.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of the present application, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

(INCLUDING ATTORNEYS FROM BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)

By: 

Robert G. Mukai

Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-662

Date: March 10, 2006